

### Remarks

In the 20 September 2007 Election/Restriction Requirement, the Examiner has offered an opinion that a restriction for the above noted application is proper because it allegedly contains two inventions. The two inventions are alleged to include the pending claims as shown below:

Invention 1 - claims 79 - 118 (Group 1); and

Invention 2 - claims 119 – 155 (Group 2)

The Examiner has also offered an opinion that restriction is proper because alleged Invention 2 does not require the use of a neural network such as those developed by alleged invention 1. As part of a response to the 20 September 2007 Election/Restriction Requirement, the Assignee is expected to select a group of claims for further examination. Accordingly the Assignee, without commenting on: whether or not there is a legitimate basis (statutory or otherwise) for the restriction, whether or not there are separate inventions, whether or not the alleged separate inventions are distinct and/or whether or not the alleged relationships between the alleged inventions are in any way similar to the relationships the Examiner has alleged exists, elects group 1 (claims 79 - 118) with traverse. The Assignee traverses the restriction requirement by noting that while a neural network is not required for the completion of the claims associated with alleged invention 2, the set of calculations normally completed by a neural network are required for completion of the processing. It is well known by those of average skill in the art that completing the calculations normally completed by a neural network does not require the use of a neural network. Furthermore, it should be noted that later inventions in the c.i.p. chain do not require a neural network for any step of processing.

### **Conclusion**

The Assignee respectfully requests consideration of the present application as amended herewith.

Respectfully submitted,

/B.J. Bennett/

B.J. Bennett, President Asset Trust, Inc.  
Date: November 20, 2007